DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 328 547 SP 032 896

AUTHOR Sparapani, Ervin F.; And Others
TITLE Middle Grades Teacher Preparation: A Future Focus.
PUB DATE Feb 91
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (71st, New Orleans, LA, February 16-18, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; Classroom Techniques; Individual Development; *Learning Strategies; *Middle Schools; Parent Teacher Conferences; Secondary Education; Social Development; *Student Needs; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Responsibility; *Teacher Student Relationship; Team Teaching

ABSTRACT

A survey of 136 junior high and middle school teachers focused primarily on teachers' knowledge about and opinions relative to curriculum and teaching strategies appropriate for the early adolescent or transescent. The teachers came from four states (Alabama, Georgia, Michigan, Pennsylvania), taught in schools in four socio-economic settings, and were considered experienced. Eight recommendations are made based on an analysis of data from the study. It is recommended that: (1) teachers learn the differences between a junior high school and a middle school; (2) teachers study transescent development; (3) teachers practice and develop cooperative and collaborative learning strategies, plus other strategies appropriate for transescents; (4) schools foster opportunities for interdisciplinary and team teaching; (5) schools provide opportunities for students to be involved in community projects; (6) teachers involve parents in classroom activities as often as possible; (7) teachers develop classroom management procedures suited to student developmental needs; and (8) states require special certification and training for teachers in junior high and middle schools. The survey form, 16 tables, and 13 references are included. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED328547

Middle Grades Teacher Preparation: A Future Focus

Ervin F. Sparapani
Saginaw Valley State University
University Center, Michigan

Frederick J. Abel
Berry College
Mount Berry, Georgia

Peter Edwards
Clarion University of Pennsylvania
Clarion, Pennsylvania

Douglas Herbster
Montana State University
Bozeman, Montana

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. F. Sparapani

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the 71st Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators held in New Orleans, Louisiana, February 18, 1991.

SP 032 896

Introduction

With the current national interest centered on middle grades education, it is important that teacher educators develop appropriate programs and courses that will assist present and future teachers in understanding and meeting the needs of the emerging adolescent. The literature about the emerging adolescent and the practices of middle grades schools, however, often is presented from the perspective of the middle grades youngster or a junior high/middle school administrator. Such a perspective is necessary and useful, but it would seem apparent that in order to develop programs for teachers, it would be helpful to know about those teachers who teach in the middle grades. The research base related to programs for and about teachers in junior high and middle schools appears to be somewhat sparse.

A review of the literature, including two ERIC searches, concerning the attitudes of middle school teachers toward their preparation yielded nothing; indicating that there has been little, if anything, done in this area. Expanding the search to the general preparation of middle school teachers was more productive and enlightening. The astonishing fact is that there has been extremely little effort in looking at middle school teacher preparation within the past five years. Only two items were found in the third ERIC search. Based on this literature search, one could conclude that the interest in middle schools and the preparation of middle school teachers has waned over the past few years. The preponderance of research on the subject occurred in the late 70s and early 80s.

A study by Ackerman (1960) of 36 NCATE schools found that most preparation programs for junior high school teachers were simply modifications of the programs for elementary or secondary teachers. This study and other works (Van Til, Vars, and Lounsbury, 1967; Dalton, 1962; and Dean, 1956) concluded that the preparation of teachers for the middle grades was unsatisfactory. Hubert (1973) found that teachers who had experience at either the junior high school or middle school were most critical of their own preparation. Teachers showed a definite

preference for experiences at this level including the student teaching experience. The literature failed to reveal any recent surveys of middle level teachers regarding their satisfaction with their preparation.

The extensive research base on middle level preparation compiled in the 60s and 70s led many states to enact legislation which recognized the need for specially trained and educated teachers for the middle grades. In the 1970s many educators cited specialized preparation and certification as the most pressing problem facing teacher education.

In 1978, there were 15 states with special preparation required to teach in the middle grades. There were also 13 states which were proposing legislation to require specialized preparation for these grades (Gillan, 1978). According to Goddard (1990), in his book *Teacher Certification Requirements in all Fifty States*, there are presently 14 states which have any specific credentials for teaching in the middle grades. It appears that concern for youngsters in the middle grades has dwindled during the decade of the 80s, and this is reflected by state departments of education in terms of certification requirements. In fact, one might have predicted this if one were to look at the numerous reports, beginning with *A Nation at Risk* (1982), on public education in the United States. Almost all of that literature deals specifically with high schools and the need for subject area competence as opposed to dealing with students at any level. Although there have been calls by educators for consideration of early childhood, elementary, and middle level education, these calls have been virtually ignored by most researchers.

Based on the review of literature on middle grades teacher education, it looks like the concern for high school curriculum has had a serious effect here too. There seems to have been very few studies attempted or published during the decade of the 80s and most of the studies were completed in the first half of the decade. The literature on middle level teacher preparation over the past five years is sparse indeed.

One of the few studies of the latter half of the 1980s dealt with effects of inservice education on the behavior and attitude of middle school science teachers. Abell (1989) found that after completing an extensive ten month inservice program which emphasized problem solving, teachers spent more class time observing and listening to students and less time lecturing. They became more student centered in their approach to teaching. The study provided evidence that an extended inservice education program can effect the teaching behaviors of science teachers in the middle grades.

It is obvious that middle schools have achieved phenomenal growth over the past 20 years compared to junior high schools. It is also obvious from the literature that states are not addressing the staffing needs of these schools. William Alexander (1987), one of the founders of the middle school movement back in the 60s, documents the progress of middle schools and the reasons why they are superior to junior high schools in meeting the needs of this age student. Middle schools provide better transition to high school, offer broader and more flexible programs, and focus on early adolescent needs. To do this successfully, these schools need teachers prepared to work specifically with this age youngster. Alexander identifies a lack of adequate teacher education as a major problem facing the middle school movement. In fact, according to Alexander and McEwin (1989), in their study entitled *Schools in the Middle: Status and Progress*, 61 percent of the 394 schools surveyed had less than 25 percent of faculty with special preparation in middle grades education and only nine percent had faculty with more than 75 percent having middle grades preparation. This should not be surprising considering the fact that so few states have any special certification requirements for the middle school. Only when state legislatures mandate special certification will colleges, schools, and departments of education offer programs leading to such certification.

There are a few signs that the movement is alive and well, contrary to the lack of cited research in the area. The New York State School Boards Association (1987) developed a position paper which examined educational policies, school effectiveness, and responses to broader public policy concerns in the context of the special needs of early adolescence. One of the major topics dealt with in the paper was the issue of special preparation and certification of middle school teachers. This is important to note since New York has no special requirements for middle school teachers.

Also, *Turning Points: Preparing American Youth for the 21st Century* (1989), a report prepared by the Carnegie Commission on Adolescent Development, has specifically recommended that middle schools be staffed with teachers who are expert at teaching young adolescents and who have the special education and training necessary for the assignment.

This review of the existing literature tells a grim tale. With all of the interest in education during the 1980s there was very little interest or activity concerning the education of the early adolescent or transescent youngster. The child in the middle was ignored then just as much as he/she has been ignored throughout the total history of American education. Considering what psychology tells us about the nature of youngsters in this critical period of development and the facets of society that they are exposed to, we must begin to address the needs of these children or we risk losing the future productivity of a large segment of our population.

To this end, the researchers surveyed junior high and middle school teachers from a cross-section of the nation. The research focussed primarily at teachers knowledge about and opinions concerning recommendations in the literature relative to curriculum and teaching strategies considered appropriate for the emerging adolescent.

Method

Data were gathered from 136 junior high and middle school teachers in four states (Alabama, N=18; Georgia, N=20; Michigan, N=65; Pennsylvania, N=33) and in schools located in four socio-economic categories (urban, urban/inner city, suburban, and rural). The researchers, however, were unable to gather data in each state for each socio-economic category. The Alabama teachers came from a suburban setting. The Georgia teachers were in suburban and rural settings. The Michigan teachers were in urban, urban/inner city, and suburban settings. The Pennsylvania teachers were all from a rural setting. The teachers decided the socio-economic setting of their school. Table 1—Demographic Information by State and Socio-Economic Category (see p. 6) shows the number of teachers by state and category.

A twenty-five item, likert-scale instrument (see survey instrument attached to the end of this report) was developed in order to obtain opinions from the junior high and middle school teachers. In addition to providing the demographic information, teachers were asked to respond to items about curriculum and instructional practices, and knowledge about transescent development. Responses on the four-point scale could range from strongly agree to strongly disagree. For purposes of data analysis and tabulation, the instrument was divided into five subsets (Curriculum and Teaching, 5 items; Instructional Practices, 9 items; Transescent Development, 5 items; Parents and Community Involvement, 4 items; and Certification and Teaching Level Preference, 2 items). The instrument was mailed to principals of the participating schools, and completed by teachers in their schools. The researchers made arrangements with the schools; the school principal asked teachers in her/his building to complete the instrument; the school principals returned the completed instruments to the researchers. All instruments that were mailed out were completed and returned.

TABLE 1
Demographic Information by State and Socio-Economic Category

Demographic Characteristics	Alabama	Georgia		Michigan			Pennsylvania
	Suburban (N=18)	Suburban (n=13)	Rural (n=7)	Suburban (n=24)	Urban (n=20)	Urban/ Inner City (n=21)	Rural (N=33)
Teach in:							
Junior High	8	2	0	6	5	19	10
Middle School	10	11	6	12	14	0	23
Years of Teaching:							
0-2	1	2	3	2	2	1	1
3-5	2	3	3	4	6	4	4
6-10	1	4	0	2	2	0	0
11-15	8	2	1	2	2	3	4
16-20	5	2	0	4	2	5	8
21-25	1	0	0	7	5	7	9
26+	0	0	0	3	1	1	7
In Middle/Junior High:							
0-2	1	2	3	9	8	2	4
3-5	3	4	2	1	5	5	4
6-10	4	3	0	3	0	4	3
11-15	6	2	1	0	0	4	6
16-20	3	1	0	4	4	0	9
21-25	1	0	0	3	2	4	5
26+	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Certification Level:							
K-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
K-8	1	1	1	10	6	3	6
K-9	0	0	0	1	2	0	0
4-8	0	5	3	0	1	0	1
5-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7-12	10	5	0	9	9	7	18
K-12	6	2	0	3	2	11	8
4-12	0	0	3	1	0	0	0
Highest Degree Earned:							
Bachelor's	2	3	0	2	5	7	4
Bachelor's +	4	6	6	10	9	1	7
Master's	3	3	1	5	3	8	8
Master's +	7	1	0	7	3	4	14
Specialist	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Doctorate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Year in which highest degree earned:							
1950-59	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
1960-64	0	0	0	1	0	2	3
1965-69	2	0	0	3	1	1	3
1970-74	4	1	0	1	5	3	6
1975-79	3	3	1	3	3	4	4
1980-84	4	5	0	5	0	4	7
1985-89	3	2	3	8	8	6	4
1990-	1	1	3	3	3	0	1

Results and Discussion

The results were tabulated by subset and category. For data analysis purposes, responses were coded Strongly Agree=4, Agree=3, Disagree=2, and Strongly Disagree=1.

Tables 2 to 16 show the analysis of these data by mean score and standard deviation. A high mean score indicates that teachers agreed to strongly agreed with that item; a low mean score indicates that teachers disagreed to strongly disagreed with that item. The instrument does not give teachers the option of neither agreeing nor disagreeing. The tables are grouped by subset followed by a brief discussion of the data in the tables.

TABLE 2
Curriculum and Teaching
Urban and Urban/Inner City

Survey Items	Michigan Urban (n=20)		Michigan Urban/Inner City (n=21)	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
1. A junior high school...	1.90	.62	2.32	.80
2. I understand the difference...	3.20	.51	2.81	.91
6. To prepare young people for...	2.95	.50	3.33	.64
12. Cooperative learning...	3.10	.54	3.20	.51
14. A structured classroom management...	2.84	.59	3.25	.73

TABLE 3
Curriculum and Teaching
Suburban

Survey Items	Alabama (N=18)		Georgia (n=13)		Michigan (n=24)	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
1. A junior high school...	2.72	.87	2.18	.57	2.30	.86
2. I understand the difference...	2.25	.79	2.85	.77	2.78	.72
6. To prepare young people for...	3.28	.45	3.18	.39	2.79	.76
12. Cooperative learning...	3.22	.53	3.31	.61	3.13	.53
14. A structured classroom management...	3.06	.64	3.08	.49	3.22	.51

TABLE 4
Curriculum and Teaching
Rural

Survey Items	Georgia (n=7)		Pennsylvania (N=33)	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
1. A junior high school...	1.57	.49	1.66	.73
2. I understand the difference...	3.43	.90	2.97	.72
6. To prepare young people for...	2.57	.49	3.12	.69
12. Cooperative learning...	3.71	.45	3.16	.57
14. A structured classroom management...	2.86	.99	3.09	.58

The data in tables 2, 3, and 4 seem to indicate that regardless of socio-economic category teachers believe that a middle school is a more appropriate setting for the transescent than a junior high school (the Alabama teachers, however, seem to be leaning toward the junior high school). All teachers, except for those from Alabama, indicate they may not understand the differences between a junior high school and a middle school. This seems the case particularly for the urban Michigan teachers and the rural Georgia teachers. The urban/inner city and suburban teachers from Michigan, and the rural teachers from Georgia disagree with the statement that schools for transescents should emphasize academics. All groups agree that cooperative learning activities should be used often with transescents. All groups, except the urban Michigan teachers and the rural teachers from Georgia, indicate that they think structured classroom management systems should be used with transescents.

TABLE 5
Instructional Practices
Urban and Urban/Inner City

Survey Items	Michigan Urban (n=20)		Michigan Urban/Inner City (n=21)	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
3. Competition is more important	1.90	.62	2.05	1.09
5. Interdisciplinary and team teaching	3.55	.50	3.05	.86
8. Lecture/discussion	2.40	.66	2.05	.50
9. Group oriented	2.40	.49	2.50	.74
10. Knowledge of C & C processes	3.11	.31	3.25	.54
11. Often use coop. learning processes	2.89	.45	3.17	.50
21. Practice oral and written ex	3.30	.56	2.88	.76
24. Transescents do not work well in groups	1.85	.65	2.35	.65
25. Interest in school work	2.25	.70	2.65	.73

TABLE 6
Instructional Practices
Suburban

Survey Items	Alabama (N=18)		Georgia (n=13)		Michigan (n=24)	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
3. Competition is more important	1.76	.81	2.00	.96	1.83	.75
5. Interdisciplinary and team teaching	3.06	.83	3.15	.77	3.05	.64
8. Lecture/discussion	2.38	.70	2.46	.63	2.00	.76
9. Group oriented	2.88	.60	2.69	.72	2.79	.64
10. Knowledge of C & C processes	3.00	.33	3.15	.36	2.87	.54
11. Often use coop. learning processes	3.00	.35	3.00	.55	2.75	.52
21. Practice oral and written ex	2.94	.56	3.00	.39	3.14	.56
24. Transescents do not work well in groups	1.94	.52	1.92	.27	1.96	.54
25. Interest in school work	2.44	.76	2.15	.53	2.54	.87

TABLE 7
Instructional Practices
Rural

Survey Items	Georgia (n=7)		Pennsylvania (N=33)	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
3. Competition is more important	1.86	.99	1.76	.70
5. Interdisciplinary and team teaching	3.57	.49	3.64	.48
8. Lecture/discussion	2.29	1.16	2.03	.65
9. Group oriented	2.71	.88	2.58	.49
10. Knowledge of C & C processes	3.86	.35	3.10	.47
11. Often use coop. learning processes	3.57	.49	2.97	.48
21. Practice oral and written ex	3.71	.45	3.25	.51
24. Transescents do not work well in groups	1.86	.64	1.88	.41
25. Interest in school work	2.43	.73	2.31	.58

Regarding instructional practices, all the teachers seem to agree that: a) learning to cooperate is more important for transescents than learning to compete; b) interdisciplinary and team teaching is important; c) that a mix of lecture/discussion and group oriented activities should be used; d) they have knowledge of collaborative and cooperative learning processes, except for the teachers from suburban Michigan and rural Georgia; e) they give transescents frequent practice in oral and written expression, except for the teachers from urban/inner city Michigan and suburban Alabama; and, f) it is difficult to get transescents interested in school work. Apparently, however, even though the teachers say it is difficult to get transescents interested in school work, these teachers

are generally attempting a variety of instructional practices, or at least they say they are. Additionally even though these teachers say they use group oriented activities and have knowledge of cooperative learning processes, they all agree that transescents don't work well in groups.

TABLE 8
Transescent Development
Urban and Urban/Inner City

Survey Items	Michigan Urban (n=20)		Michigan Urban/Inner City (n=21)	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
4. Understand transescent development	2.95	.60	2.95	.74
7. Build a positive self concept	3.50	.67	3.71	.45
17. Time fostering personal trust	3.25	.54	3.29	.63
22. Learn appropriate social skills	2.95	.60	3.21	.52
23. Consider a teacher their friend	2.95	.51	2.90	.62

TABLE 9
Transescent Development
Suburban

Survey Items	Alabama (N=18)		Georgia (n=13)		Michigan (n=24)	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
4. Understand transescent development	3.00	.49	3.00	.55	2.75	.66
7. Build a positive self concept	3.61	.49	3.54	.50	3.71	.45
17. Time fostering personal trust	3.11	.57	3.23	.42	3.26	.53
22. Learn appropriate social skills	3.00	.50	2.77	.58	2.76	.75
23. Consider a teacher their friend	3.11	.57	2.77	.58	2.63	.70

TABLE 10
Transescent Development
Rural

Survey Items	Georgia (n=7)		Pennsylvania (N=33)	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
4. Understand transescent development	3.29	.88	3.13	.55
7. Build a positive self concept	3.86	.35	3.82	.39
17. Time fostering personal trust	3.57	.49	3.19	.58
22. Learn appropriate social skills	3.71	.45	2.93	.57
23. Consider a teacher their friend	3.14	.83	2.91	.52

Understanding of transescents and their development (Tables 8, 9, & 10) is mixed. Four groups (suburban Alabama, suburban Georgia, rural Georgia, and rural Pennsylvania) say they do. Three groups (all in Michigan) indicate they may not. All the Michigan teachers are located in industrial

centers with high population areas. Perhaps transescents in such areas are more difficult to understand. Also all teachers agree that it is important to provide classroom opportunities for the development of positive self concepts and to spend time developing a personal trust relationship.

It is interesting to note that although previously the teachers indicated that they use cooperative learning techniques in their classrooms, and have knowledge of collaborative and cooperative learning processes, only three of the seven groups of teachers (urban/inner city Michigan, suburban Alabama, and rural Georgia) say they provide opportunities for learning appropriate social skills. This seems to be a contradiction. Teachers may use cooperative learning techniques and have knowledge of the process, but may not understand how to appropriately apply the procedures, or the intent of such procedures beyond knowledge acquisition. Also, even though the teachers say they spend time fostering a personal trust relationship, only two groups of teachers (suburban Alabama and rural Georgia) agree that a transescent should consider the teacher their friend. Perhaps teachers interpret "trust relationship" and "friend" differently.

TABLE 11
Parents and Community Involvement
Urban and Urban/Inner City

Survey Items	Michigan Urban (n=20)		Michigan Urban/Inner City (n=21)	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
13. Should be regularly involved in community action projects	3.05	.60	3.00	.32
16. Home/school links	3.70	.46	3.67	.47
18. Are regularly involved	2.22	.53	2.06	.78
20. Parents are actively involved	2.30	.46	1.95	.69

TABLE 12
Parents and Community Involvement
Suburban

Survey Items	Alabama (N=18)		Georgia (n=13)		Michigan (n=24)	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
13. Should be regularly involved in community action projects	3.00	.58	2.92	.47	3.21	.41
16. Home/school links	3.78	.42	3.62	.49	3.46	.50
18. Are regularly involved	2.47	.61	2.38	.49	2.20	.51
20. Parents are actively involved	2.35	.68	2.08	.62	2.13	.60

TABLE 13
Parents and Community Involvement
Rural

Survey Items	Georgia (n=7)		Pennsylvania (N=33)	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
13. Should be regularly involved in community action projects	3.29	.45	3.03	.40
16. Home/school links	4.00	.00	3.50	.50
18. Are regularly involved	3.00	.53	2.10	.55
20. Parents are actively involved	2.43	.90	1.87	.42

Tables 11, 12, and 13 focus at parent involvement in schools and transescent involvement in community projects. All the teachers agree that keeping a strong link between home and school is important. Parents are not, however, actively involved in classes. Perhaps teachers see a difference between strong linkages between home and school and parental involvement in the transescent's classes. Additionally, all the teachers (except suburban Georgia) agree that transescents should be regularly involved in community projects. Only the group of teachers from rural Georgia, however, say they regularly involve transescents in community action projects.

TABLE 14
Certification and Teaching Level Preference
Urban and Urban/Inner City

Survey items	Michigan Urban (n=20)		Michigan Urban/Inner City (n=21)	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
15. Junior high/middle school certification	2.65	.73	2.95	.84
19. Teaching level preference	1.89	.79	2.40	.97

TABLE 15
Certification and Teaching Level Preference
Suburban

Survey Items	Alabama (N=18)		Georgia (n=13)		Michigan (n=24)	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
15. Junior high/middle school certification	2.61	.76	3.23	.58	2.71	.79
19. Teaching level preference	1.94	.62	2.08	1.00	2.87	.95

TABLE 16
Certification and Teaching Level Preference
Rural

Survey Items	Georgia (n=7)		Pennsylvania (N=33)	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
15. Junior high/middle school certification	3.43	.73	2.47	.72
19. Teaching level preference	1.86	.83	1.74	.72

All groups of teachers (except for the teachers from Georgia) disagree that teachers who teach in junior high schools or middle schools should hold certification specifically oriented toward junior high/middle schools. Perhaps that is because Georgia is the only state represented that has such certification. All groups of teachers indicate they would prefer teaching in an elementary school or a high school rather than a junior high or middle school. The suburban Michigan teachers come the closest to disagreeing with that statement.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Although these data have not been gathered from a true cross-section of junior high and middle school teachers, the researchers believe that the data do represent the opinions of what might be considered typical of teachers who regularly teach in a junior high and/or middle school. The teachers come from four states, teach in both junior high schools and middle schools in four socio-economic settings, and represent a broad range of years of teaching experience and degree level. Also, the results appear to be consistent with much of what is currently in the literature. The researchers believe, therefore, that it is acceptable and appropriate to draw conclusions about practice in junior high/middle schools and make suggestions for future teacher training. Based on the data described in this report, the researchers make the following generalizations:

1. The teachers do not seem to understand the difference between a junior high school and a middle school even though they believe middle schools are a more appropriate setting for the transescent.
2. A school for transescents should emphasize self concept and social skill development over academics.
3. The teachers say they use group oriented activities and have knowledge of the process, but may not understand application procedures. They also indicate that transescents do not work well in groups.
4. The teachers agree that interdisciplinary and team teaching is important, but the researchers wonder about the extent of interdisciplinary teaming.
5. The teachers (although it is somewhat mixed) seem to agree that they understand transescent developmental needs and the importance of building a trust relationship, but they separate a "trust" relationship from a "friend" relationship and indicate that they prefer a "structured classroom management system." This seems contradictory. It would be interesting to find out how these teachers define "trust," "friend," and "structured classroom management system."
6. The teachers agree that transescents should be involved in community projects, but seldom seem to provide for such activities.
7. The teachers agree that a strong connection between parents and the school is important, but make few opportunities to get parents involved.
8. The teachers, except for those from Georgia, seem to think that it is unnecessary to have special certification to teach in a junior high school and/or middle school.

It is recommended:

1. Teachers learn the differences between a junior high school and a middle school.

2. Teachers study transescent development.
3. Teachers not only learn about, but practice and develop cooperative and collaborative learning strategies, plus other strategies appropriate for transescents.
4. Schools foster opportunities for interdisciplinary and team teaching.
5. Schools provide opportunities for transescents to be regularly involved in community projects.
6. Teachers involve parents in classroom activities as often as possible.
7. Teachers need opportunities to discuss and develop classroom management procedures suited to transescent developmental needs.
8. States need to require special certification and training for teachers in junior high and middle schools.

The data reported here suggest that teachers may have knowledge of transescent development and, also, may have knowledge of instructional strategies appropriate for the transescent. The data seem to suggest further that these same teachers may not fully understand how to use what they know. If these suggestions are accurate and if the transescent is at a critical juncture in her/his development (the researchers believe both assumptions are accurate), the researchers urge that both school level professionals and teacher educators get actively involved in restructuring the teacher preparation process for middle grades teachers.

References

Abell, S.K. (1989). *The effect of a problem solving program on the classroom behaviors and attitudes of middle school science teachers.* Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 306 094)

Ackerman, R.E. (1960). *A critical analysis of programs for junior high teachers in teacher education institutions of the United States.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Alexander, W.M. (1987). Toward schools in the middle: Progress and problems. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 2, 314–329.

Alexander, W.M. & McEwin, K.C. (1989). *Schools in the middle: Status and progress.* Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.

Carnegie Commission on Adolescent Development. (1989). *Turning points: Preparing American youth for the 21st century.* Washington, D.C.

Dalton, E.L. (1962). *Preparation programs for junior high school teachers.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville.

Dean, L.W. (1956). *A preparation program for junior high school teachers.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

Gillan, R.E. (1978). *Teacher preparation and certification for the middle school grades.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 178 463)

Goddard, R.E. (1990). *Teacher certification requirements in all fifty states* (8th ed.). Sebring, FL: Teacher Certification Publications.

Hubert, J.B. (1969). *A survey of the attitudes of prospective and experienced secondary school teachers toward the junior high school.* Unpublished masters thesis, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative of educational reform*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

New York State School Boards Association. (1987). *Meeting in the middle: Directions in schooling for young adolescents. A position paper*. Albany: (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 290 207)

Van Til, W., Vars, G. & Lounsbury, J. (1967). *Modern education for the junior high school years*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

THE JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHER SURVEY

Please respond to the survey by circling SA, A, D, or SD

SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree

1.	A junior high school is more appropriate for transescents than a middle school.	SA	A	D	SD
2.	I understand the difference between a junior high school curriculum and a middle school curriculum.	SA	A	D	SD
3.	In a junior high and/or middle school, competition is more important than cooperation.	SA	A	D	SD
4.	I understand transescents and their developmental processes.	SA	A	D	SD
5.	Interdisciplinary and team teaching is important in junior high and middle schools.	SA	A	D	SD
6.	To prepare young people for the 21st century, schools for transescents should emphasize academics.	SA	A	D	SD
7.	It is important to provide classroom opportunities for transescents to build a positive self-concept.	SA	A	D	SD
8.	My classes are mainly lecture/discussion.	SA	A	D	SD
9.	My classes are mainly group oriented.	SA	A	D	SD
10.	I have knowledge of collaborative and cooperative learning processes.	SA	A	D	SD
11.	I often use cooperative learning processes in my classes.	SA	A	D	SD
12.	Cooperative learning activities should be used often in junior high/middle schools.	SA	A	D	SD
13.	Transescents should be regularly involved in community action projects.	SA	A	D	SD
14.	A structured classroom management system should be used with transescents.	SA	A	D	SD
15.	Teachers in junior high/middle schools should hold junior high/middle school certification.	SA	A	D	SD
16.	Keeping a strong link between the home and the school is important.	SA	A	D	SD
17.	I spend a great deal of my time fostering a personal trust relationship with my students.	SA	A	D	SD
18.	In my classes, transescents are regularly involved in community action projects.	SA	A	D	SD
19.	I would prefer teaching in an elementary school or a high school.	SA	A	D	SD
20.	Parents are actively involved in my classes.	SA	A	D	SD
21.	Transescents in my classes are given frequent (daily) opportunities to practice oral and written expression.	SA	A	D	SD
22.	Transescents in my classes are given frequent opportunities to learn appropriate social skills from a team concept.	SA	A	D	SD
23.	It is important for transescents to consider a teacher their friend.	SA	A	D	SD
24.	Transescents do not work well in groups.	SA	A	D	SD
25.	It is difficult to get transescents interested in school work.	SA	A	D	SD

Comments (anything you would like to say about teaching transescents?):

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please complete the following as each applies to you.

I teach in a: Junior High School ___
Middle School ___

The area in which the school is located would be considered:

Urban ___
Urban/Inner City ___
Suburban ___
Rural ___

I have ___ years of teaching experience.

I have been teaching in a junior high/middle school for ___ years.

The grade level(s) I teach is/are: _____.

The subject(s) I teach is/are: _____.

My current teaching certification is (check all that apply):elementary (K-4) ___;(K-8)___;

junior high/middle school (4-8) ___; (5-9) ___; secondary (7-12) ___.

I hold a (check highest degree earned): Bachelor's degree ___; Bachelor's + ___;

Master's degree ___; Master's +___; Specialist ___; Doctorate ___.

The year in which I completed my highest degree is ___.

The State in which I am currently teaching is ___.

(Please complete the survey on the reverse.)